

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 1.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 38.

| \$1.50 in advance. |

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1825.

| \$2 at the end of the year. |

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the
Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

SCRIPTURE TEACHINGS.

Having already considered the tender relation in which all men stand to the Creator of the universe, as the proper basis on which to erect the superstructure of all moral obligation, we propose here to consider some of the essential duties growing out of this relation, and which are embraced by the sublime injunction of the *wise man*—"My son, give me thine heart, and let thine eyes observe my ways."

That all men are properly the subjects of this address, is evident from the fact that the duties which the command enjoins are strictly obligatory upon every class of human society. What these duties are, is the business of our present inquiry and labour.

By the heart, as here used, we are led to believe that every moral faculty of the soul is intended. The will of intelligent beings is evidently concerned in the discharge of this obligation: for nothing short of "the willing mind is accepted" with the Omniscient Creator. No offering, however great, nor sacrifice of painful endurance can receive the sanction of his approbation, except it be accompanied with a cheerful willingness of the mind. The wishes and desires of the heart must be in accordance with the will of God. But this would be an unreasonable demand, and one with which a compliance would be impossible, if the will of the Creator were not in accordance with the welfare of intelligent beings, for it is impossible that such beings should *wish* or *desire* misery for themselves; and it would be impious for them to desire it for others, since it is a primary obligation of the law of Christ to love our enemies and all mankind. The duty, however, of having our wishes conformed to the will of God, becomes easy and delightful, when we are assured by the voice of holy inspiration that Jehovah *wills* and *delights* in the happiness of the whole intelligent creation.

To give our hearts to God, which is the plain requisition of the motto we have chosen, implies the duty of affection and love. This is the *first* and great commandment of Heaven's law—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." Nor is this command destitute of the most satisfactory reasons for its support. The Being who is presented as the object of our supreme affections possesses every amiable and perfect quality. His character combines the fulness of wisdom, power and love, and these are commensurate with infinite space and

infinite duration! The command, then, instead of being severe and unreasonable, is the most delightful and exalted exercise of the moral powers of man. It is certainly a very equitable demand for us to cherish the sentiments of love to that Being from whom we are daily receiving all the blessings of life, and to whom we must look, and from whom we can alone expect the favour of peace in death, and the bliss of heaven in eternal continuance. The perfect propriety of this obligation is briefly and beautifully expressed in one simple sentence—*He hath first loved us.*

The dedication of the heart to God embraces the exercise of the understanding in a way of submission to the wholesome rules which infinite wisdom hath prescribed for the regulation of our conduct and desires. Without the exercise of the understanding we could in no case comprehend the designs of Providence, nor submit with resignation to the adverse visitations of his hand. Without the use of our reason or understanding, we should remain alike insensible to pleasure or remorse, and incapable of distinguishing between holiness and sin. The revelations of heaven, and the fables of philosophic infidelity, would be alike in point of utility to man, where the understanding is not concerned. Hence, in order to derive any practical advantages from the revelations of the divine will, the mind must be devoted to the contemplation of his truth. To be *wise above what is written*, would be a perversion of the use of the understanding, and an idolatrous adoration of mere human qualities. The mind or understanding must therefore be dedicated to God, and be devoted to the contemplation of his truth, from which we derive a knowledge of our duty and of his will, by the which a permanent foundation is laid for the exercise of the most rational piety and cheerful hope. Nor are the will, the affections, and the understanding, alone, to be offered to the Creator.

The memory should be called into delightful exercise for a retrospection of those favours and mercies with which the journey of life has been thus far crowned, and by which the legacy of mortal existence is rendered desirable in its continuance. The exercise of this faculty is necessary, in order that subjects of heart-felt gratitude may constantly rise into view. The mercies of God, displayed in ten thousand different forms before us, and the infiniteness of his grace and love, revealed in the Mediator of the everlasting covenant, eloquently invite the offering up of our hearts in gratitude and thanksgiving.

Finally, we should trust Jehovah with all our hearts, for the temporal bounties of his providence, for the forgiveness of our sins, for the instructions of his wisdom, for the inspirations of his truth, for the assistance of his grace, for the cheering and sanctifying influences of his love, and for all the hopes of future immortality and glory with which the revelations of his will so copiously abound.

The duty of observing the ways of God, for the pious imitation of our lives, will be reserved for a future number.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

A HINT TO PROFESSORS.

"—Judge not."

It would seem as though Christians, seldom, if ever, glanced an eye at this injunction of their divine Instructor, as though they entirely neglected the weightier matters of duty, and the cultivation of friendship and brotherly affection, and were too willing to grant an unrestrained indulgence to the grosser passions of the heart.

How often do we hear condemnatory sentences denounced against those who have named the divine Redeemer, who love the Lord, and who are endeavouring to walk in the paths of truth and righteousness with humility and meekness of spirit. The practice of condemning those who differ from ourselves in sentiment, as unworthy and unchristian, is surely a very odious one, and fraught with destructive and fatal consequences. It is not only repugnant to the good feelings of the heart, but it is in direct contrariety to the commandments, and to the example of the Great Head of the christian family. It may be said in truth, that professors of religion, by their own conduct—by their continual dissensions—by the disposition they manifest to those whose views are not in perfect harmony with their own, and by their bad example, have been a greater barrier to its progress, and have attached more disgrace to the Christian name, than the combined forces of *heathenism*, *deism*, and *atheism*, unassisted by so powerful arguments as the impurity of their lives have furnished, could ever have effected!

It is not my design, or wish, to prohibit free inquiry, nor do I wish, or mean to be understood as inimical to polemick discussion, or religious controversies, so far as there is an adherence to the requisitions of the gospel maintained, and a desire to ascertain and defend the truth. It is a duty we owe to ourselves, to our fellow-beings, and to our Creator, to seek the truth. For it is certain, that the condition of men in a kingdom of light, is far different, and far preferable, to that of men in the region of darkness. It becomes us then, as intelligent beings, to use every exertion, and every laudable means which the Creator hath placed within our reach, to obtain right views of his character, and of the plan of his moral government, and to believe, love, and adore his eternal truth. The Christian has an undoubted right to contend earnestly for the truth as he receives and believes it, and also to reject and aim at the destruction of error. But he should use the proper weapons in his defence and in his attack;—*scripture* and *reason*, which are the *gifts of God*, and the only instruments which will accomplish the purpose. The man whose religious views or feelings will per-

mit him to slander, abuse, and destroy the reputation of a brother, or of a denomination of Christians is, in the scriptural sense of the word a murderer, and hath not eternal life abiding in him. Let christians think of these things: let them recollect that when they are slandering and condemning a brother, they are not only violating every christian obligation, and trampling upon the commandments of HIM whose disciples they profess themselves, but they are disgracing the christian religion, and are a dead weight to the community to which they belong.

J. H. B.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

"—Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth." Acts xix. 25.

I was reminded of this argument of Demetrius, on hearing a preacher in this town, eminent for biblical research and disquisition, descant upon Luke viii. 37 and 40. These were the passages selected as the text: but by a subterfuge, the speaker more properly discoursed from the 38th verse. The reason of this sudden transition we think is furnished in the passage which stands at the head of this article—*Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.*

In the intervening verse (38) there is mention made of a man out of whom Jesus had cast devils.—Our discourse, therefore, (if it be not a perversion of the term) may be denominated a dissertation upon *Demons!*

The speaker offered some views which wise men have entertained of the *Devils of Palestine*, or of those spirits which were said to possess the inhabitants of that land, at the time of our Saviour's pilgrimage, and during the apostolick age.—That it had been the opinion of some controvertists, *alias* hereticks, that the persons who were considered as possessed of devils, were in reality only labouring under some bodily infirmity, or mental derangement; which opinions, it is needless to add, received his unqualified disapprobation, and were proscribed as unscriptural and unphilosophical.

After denouncing the opinions of *others*, he proceeded to make known to our anxious minds the *real* character of those evil spirits or tormentors of the Palestinians. He called them roaring lions, which were ever striving to render the children of God miserable—to subvert the plans of the Omnipotent Creator—and to seduce his offspring from his favour, that he might people his sulphurous regions—that he delighted in the anguish of the soul—that he loved the destruction and misery of men—and aims wholly at his ruin and eternal perdition.

His method of reasoning was neither pleasing nor convincing. In his attempt to establish the personality of the Devil, he adverted to the fact of their being possessed of the gift of speech. But are we to infer from the fact that they are represented as having the power of speech, they possess identical being, or that they have personality or intelligence? If so, then we are bound, not only to ascribe personality, but moral intelligence, to Baalam's ass—for it is related that the animal vociferated against the abuse of his master, & said unto Baalam, "am I not thine ass?" If, therefore, the identity or personality of Devils be

proved in the one case, it is, by parity of reasoning, proved also in the other: For both are represented as *speaking*, and according to the gentlemen's argument, we have *personal* Devils and *personal* beasts.

The preacher offered as a reason, why the devils were permitted to enter into the swine, the following:—That it was to punish the Jews, who raised them in order to enrich themselves; as it was a sort of lucrative traffick or commerce which they carried on with the Gentiles.—That in consequence of their carrying on such traffick and of making themselves opulent from the cultivation of this animal, the devils were made to enter them, accomplishing their destruction and the ruin of their owners.—All this was to punish the Jews for their iniquitous deeds and for their dishonesty. This we must confess is a new and singular *punishment* for sin: However, it sounds so much better than *eternal punishment* or *endless misery*, that we will pass it by for the present.

Here is something worthy of notice. It is said that these Devils, when Jesus commanded them to come out of the man, desired to enter into the herd of swine which was feeding on the mountain: And that Christ suffered them. It is furthermore related, that they *entered into the swine*, & that in consequence of this, the swine were driven into the lake and choked. We would now inquire of the preacher what the poor swine had done that they should be tormented of the devil; and likewise what became of those devils or tormentors? The last of these queries we conceive must be peculiarly interesting to the advocates of the *personality* and *eternity* of Demons. For in this instance they either run away with the swine, or the swine with them. We think however that the latter conclusion is the most inferential; for it is said that the *devils entered into the swine*, and that the swine ran violently into the lake. As we have no evidence of their having escaped from the swine, nor any news from them since, it is evident that they were run away with, and (for aught we know) destroyed by the swine. In order therefore to maintain the eternity of devils, this preacher or some other theologian, who feels as lively and deep an interest in their health and perpetuity, must devise some plan to redeem them from the swine, and from the bosom of the *deep*, which they so much dreaded. Until this is done, we advise this preacher and all others, *who by this traffick have their wealth*, to cease propagating the ridiculous and notoriously absurd sentiment, of *real, personal, and eternal Devils.*

J. H. B.

REV. MR. FISK'S SERMON.

A brief review of the Rev. Mr. Fisk's Sermon, delivered in Providence, R. I. in June, 1823, before the New-England Conference.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 145.)

With a view to establish the supposition that sin merits an infinite punishment, Mr. F. asserts, "(1) 'To neglect the offers of God, is criminal in proportion to the extent of the blessing proffered by God and rejected by the transgressor. But the blessing proffered by God and rejected by the transgressor is infinite. Therefore, to neglect this blessing, is an act stamped with infinite terribleness.'"

This proposition is extremely defective in its most essential feature, to say the least. It supposes that the magnitude of the *offer*, and not the *ability* in man to comprehend the importance of the blessing, determines the magnitude of the offence. According to this theorem, the criminality of a *child*, on whose mind the light of reason just begins to dawn, is equal to that which results from the sinful indulgence of the most profound in the science of wisdom! A Locke, a Newton, or a Payley, could not be more criminal by transgressing the command of God, than the most stupid and unintelligent of moral agents! No man, exercising a sound and reflecting mind, can avoid seeing the weakness of such a conclusion: and yet Mr. F's argument for the infinite criminality of sin, must stand or fall with this hypothesis.

We should in this place inquire; can the man, who, by *one* act of neglect, renders himself *infinitely criminal* in the sight of God, heighten the real picture of his depravity? can he increase his criminality? can he render his condition any worse? He cannot, unless that which is infinite may be augmented! unless the man who is *infinitely criminal* can become *more* than infinitely criminal! As every reader must see that this would be impossible, he cannot avoid discovering the weakness and incongruity of Mr. F's argument. Convince any being that his criminality cannot be increased, after he has committed one offence, and you effectually furnish him with a license to sin with impunity all the rest of his life, and without incurring the least possible danger of increasing his punishment. The moral effect, therefore, of this theory is of the most pernicious kind.

We may inquire still further; is this sentiment which we are considering, in accordance with the scriptures? It is not; for Christ declares that "that servant who knew his Lord's will and did it not shall be beaten with many stripes: But he who knew not his Lord's will, but committed deeds worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." Here the Saviour evidently measures the extent of criminality and punishment by the knowledge which the subject possesses. But according to Mr. F. the two characters mentioned by Christ were equally criminal, and of course, equally obnoxious to the same extent of punishment. Again; St. Peter was of opinion that his brethren had better have remained ignorant of the gospel, than after they had known the way of righteousness, to depart from the holy commandment which they had received. But this is totally a mistake, provided one offence rendered them infinitely criminal.—And the Scriptures speak of certain characters waxing *worse* and *worse*. But this would be an egregious blunder in revelation, if by the first offence a man were rendered infinitely criminal: for in such case he could never become worse. It is needless to multiply arguments and quote scripture testimony to prove the unsoundness of Mr. F's theorem; for the sober exercise of reason can scarcely fail to discover at the first view, the weakness and absurdity of the position. Mr. F. has evidently fallen into this error by taking for granted what we have before disproved; namely, that the reward of virtuous actions is infinite: Not considering that a fountain cannot send forth a stream to rise above its own

level. But admitting, for a moment that sin is an infinite evil, it must follow of necessity that all sinful actions are alike great; for there can be no greater and lesser infinities—Hence the Saviour, in his declaration to Pontius Pilate; “he that delivered me to thee hath the greater sin,” is to be set entirely aside, and the Prince of Heaven charged with the want of a proper sense of the magnitude of sin!

In closing this number, we will just notice the passage of scripture which is supposed by Mr. F. to give support to his theory in this instance. Heb. ii. 3. “How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation.” Does St. Paul, in this passage, say any thing about the *infinite criminality of sin*? Not a syllable—He only assures his brethren that those who neglected *so great* salvation as that revealed in the gospel, should not escape the just punishment of their offence. The argument of the apostle in the preceding verse, entirely overthrows the hypothesis of Mr. F. “If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation.” Now, we ask, how was it possible for the transgressors under the law to have received a just recompense of reward while they remained under the first covenant, if their offences were *stamped with infinite turpitude*? Did they receive an infinite punishment before St. Paul wrote this epistle? Our opponent will not pretend that such is the fact—And yet the apostle must be charged with falsehood unless they did, according to Mr. F’s statement of the infinite criminality of sin. The truth, however, is easy to be comprehended in the case before us: Paul reminds the Hebrews of the uniform faithfulness of God, in punctually executing punishment on the transgressors under the law; and then reasons with them by way of inquiry—will God be less exact in punishing those who neglect the great salvation revealed in the gospel, than he has been in the administration of chastisement under the law? But this apostle has, neither expressly, or by implication, taught the extravagant hypothesis of infinitude in the character of sin.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ANECDOTE

REV. MR. PICKERING,

Having somewhere seen the following anecdote concerning a celebrated Poet (whose name I cannot now remember) I take the liberty to send it you. It was brought to my recollection by reading the piece concerning Milton in the Telescope.

The Poet was one day walking in the garden with two ladies—one of them his intended bride, when a message was brought informing that a friend in the house wished to see him. He expressed himself loath to leave the society of the fair ones, and refused to go.—They united in entreating him to leave them—he persisted in refusing.—They then attempted to force him from the garden: at length yielding reluctantly he bowed and repeated the following lines.

Thus Adam look’d when from the garden driven,
And thus, disputed orders sent from heaven,
Like him I go, but yet to go am loath,
Like him, I go, for Angels drove us both,

Hard was his fate, but mine, still more unkind,
His Eve went with him, but mine stays behind.

SELECTIONS.

FROM THE (CHARLESTON, S. C.) UNITARIAN DEFENDANT.

SPIRIT OF ORTHODOXY.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 148.)

To the exercise of this right the spirit of orthodoxy—and it is to this point chiefly that we wish to bring the attention of our readers, is essentially hostile. Not that our orthodox brethren do, in words, deny the native right of all men to think for themselves, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. On the contrary they loudly disavow any disposition to interfere with the exercise of this right; and seem to take high offence when charged with such assumption. If they are sincere, as doubtless most of them are, in this disavowal, then we have only to say, they “*know not what manner of spirit they are of*.” It is no new thing for individuals and bodies of men, to act what, perhaps even to themselves, they dare not avow. Men do not readily perceive, or admit, at least, that their practice is repugnant to principles, which they cannot, or dare not, controvert. The irresponsibility of man to man in things pertaining to the conscience; the entire freedom of religious opinions; is so fully recognised and guaranteed by our civil constitutions, that no one, probably, can be found, who would be disposed to call it in question. Still, we repeat, the spirit of orthodoxy is hostile to the exercise of this right; and the *practice* of the orthodox shows that it is so. They certainly do consider, and treat error in opinion as a proper subject of censure and discipline. They certainly do withhold communion from those who cannot, for conscience sake, subscribe to every article of their creed. They certainly do expel from their churches all those, whom they detect in the mortal sin of relinquishing any of those articles, which they choose to consider as fundamental. Thus, as far as their power and influence extend, blasting their characters, destroying their peace, and cutting them off from the best blessings of the social state. All this they certainly do, and all this they maintain they have a *right* to do; and yet they aver that in so doing, christian liberty is not infringed—that christian charity, even, is not violated. Now we ask what is the difference, in *spirit*, between these pretensions, and those of the Romish Church, in the darkest periods of her domination? She claimed the power of judging of the soundness and sufficiency of the faith of individuals. So do they.—She claimed the right of prescribing terms of communion. So do they, and exercise it too. She claimed the right of preserving what she denominated the *purity* of the church; and, for this purpose, of cutting off such whose creed did not conform to her standard. So do they.—She talked much of mysterious dogmas, which it was neither lawful, nor safe to investigate. The orthodox of the present day hold the same language. Yet they are indignant at the charge of cherishing a persecuting spirit; and ask, “where are the evidences of its existence?” We answer, *wherever orthodoxy is the dominant sect*. They do not, indeed, stretch heretics on the rack, suspend them on the gibbet, or burn them at the stake. They want the power to do this. The constitution of our country throws its protecting shield around our persons and our property. But are these the only methods by which a persecuting spirit can display itself? Are there no means, by which it can fasten its fangs upon the mind? Is it nothing to a man of lofty and generous spirit to perceive himself, without any act of demerit, on his part, an object for the finger of suspicion to point at? To be received when brought, by the necessary intercourse of business, into contact with his fellow-men, with cold and constrained civility, if not

with entire neglect, or absolute rudeness? Is it nothing to such a man, to find his usefulness every day circumscribed, his lawful and honourable pursuits impeded, and his success in life blasted by an invisible, but fatal influence? Is it nothing to a man of devotional feelings to find himself cut off from the comforts of christian society; to find his presence alone sufficient to check all freedom of communication, and to chill all the kindling sympathies of the heart? Ah! he knows little of human nature, who cannot understand, that persecution of this character—instances of which no one need look far to find—is sufficient to break down and harass many a spirit, which the prospect of the rack, or the gibbet could never bend.

It is against this spirit of orthodoxy that our practical and weightiest objections lie. We regard it as, in its very nature, a *persecuting spirit*; a spirit equally arrogant in its pretensions, and pernicious in its effects; a spirit hostile to freedom, and therefore hostile to truth. For truth and freedom can never be separated.

Its tendency is to deter men from examining the foundations of their belief, by alarming them with the danger of falling into error. It interdicts the highest and noblest exercise of the rational powers by studiously representing the provinces of faith and reason as totally distinct; thus rendering the latter imbecile and cowardly, and reducing the former to a blind and indiscriminating acquiescence in the dogmas of our spiritual guides. It is a spirit, in short, closely allied to ignorance and barbarism; and, if permitted to exercise uncontrolled sway, would conduct society back to the darkness of the tenth century.

We regard it as of immense importance to keep this practical tendency of the orthodox system steadily in view, as constituting the great and essential distinction between it, and liberal christianity. The difference, great as it confessedly is, between us and them on certain speculative points, we consider as trifling in comparison. The operative, and practical difference between their system and ours, is this: that they consider error in belief as necessarily involving moral guilt,—and that we do not; that they regard the belief of certain doctrines *essential* to salvation—and that we do not; that they consider it their right and duty to exclude from their communion all who will not subscribe to their creed—and that we do not. Their system is a system of *exclusiveness*; it shuts up all truth, all piety and all hope within its own pale: ours teaches us to believe that these may exist among christians of every name.

Far be it from us, however, to affirm, or to suppose, that this system does actually produce its full effects upon all who embrace it. We are aware, as we have heretofore remarked, that it is only a partial and modified influence which opinions exert upon the characters of men. Still, *some influence* opinions such as these must of necessity have; and an influence proportionate, ordinarily, to the strength and vivacity of the faith, with which they are received. It is not in the nature of things, that he who regards the opinions of his neighbour as fatal and damnable errors—as decisive evidences of a corrupt heart, and a reprobate mind, should long continue to cherish toward him a cordial good will. Considering him as the enemy of God and of goodness, he will not be slow in learning to consider him as *his* enemy too. Mutual courtesy and christian kindness will melt away under the influence of such a system like wax before the fire. Various circumstances in the character, habits, and condition of different individuals, may check, or counteract this spirit—still it exists; it is inherent in the system of opinions we are treating of; and will to a greater or less degree, be productive of its natural effects. These effects we think are adverse to the happiness of individuals, and to the harmony and welfare of society. They are not the effects, we are persuaded, which the gospel was designed, and which when rightly understood, it is adapted to produce.

INFLUENCE OF THE FEMALE CHARACTER.

Compare the condition and pursuits of the mass of men with those of women, and tell me on which side lies the inferiority. While the greater part of our sex are engaged in turning up the clods of the earth, fashioning the materials which are to supply the physical wants of our race, exchanging the products of the industry of different countries, toiling amidst the perils of war and the tumults of politics, to you is committed the nobler task of moulding the infant mind—it is for you to give their characters to succeeding ages; it is yours to control the stormy passions of man, to inspire him with those sentiments which subdue his ferocity, and make his heart gentle and soft; it is yours to open to him the truest and purest source of happiness, and prompt him to the love of virtue and religion. A WIFE! A MOTHER! How sacred, how venerable these names! What nobler object can the most aspiring ambition propose to itself, than to fulfil the duties which these relations imply!—Instead of murmuring that your field of influence is so narrow, my friends, should you not rather tremble at the magnitude and sacredness of your responsibility? When you demand of a man a higher education than has hitherto been given you, and claim to drink from the same wells of knowledge as himself, should it not be that you may be thus enabled, not to rush into that sphere which nature has marked for him, but to move more worthily and gracefully within your own.—*Thatcher's Sermons.*

LUTHER.

Luther was particularly severe against, and denounced all preachers that aimed "at sublimity, difficulty, and eloquence; and neglecting the care of the souls of the poor, seek their own praise and honor, and to please one or two persons of consequence"—"When a man comes into the pulpit for the first time," says he, "he is much perplexed at the number of heads that are before him. When I stand in the pulpit, I see no heads, but imagine those that are before me to be all blocks. When I preach I sink myself deeply down: I regard neither doctors nor masters, of which there are in the church above forty. But I have an eye to the multitude of young people, children, and servants, of which there are more than two thousand. I preach to them, and direct my discourse to those that have need of it. A preacher should be a logician and a rhetorician; that is, he must be able to teach and to admonish. When he preaches upon any article, he must first distinguish it, then define, describe, and show what it is; thirdly, he must produce sentences from the Scripture to prove and strengthen it; fourthly, he must explain it by examples; fifthly, he must adorn it with similitudes; and lastly, he must admonish and rouse the indolent, correct the disobedient, and reprove the authors of false doctrine."

Court the company of the learned, and the conversation of the aged; their discourse is often more useful than any book you can read.

To think well, and not do well, amounts to no more than to dream well.

FROM THE RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER.

HOPE.

When the fond heart doth sink full low,
From brightest objects riven,
And life's fair scenes look pale with woe,
And darkness circles pleasure's brow,
How sweet the hope of heaven.

When sorrow heaves the troubled breast,
Like waves by tempest driven;
When the hurt spirit, deep distressed,
Like wave-borne bark can find no rest,
How bright the thought of heaven.

And when the dreams of life are fled,
And death's keen sting is given;
How calmly may we rest our head,
While angels circle round our bed,
To wing our souls to heaven.

TO MY MOTHER.

When I was sick, and hope had fled,
Who kindly watch'd around my bed,
And bath'd my pain'd, my aching head?
My Mother!

Who strove to calm my feverish hours,
By love and pity's soothing powers?
Who sought to strew my couch with flowers?
My Mother!

Who, when my heart was faint, and pain
Disturb'd my sick, distemper'd brain,
Would sit and weep, but ne'er complain?
My Mother!

And who, beside my bed, with eye
Uplifted to her God, on high,
Would pray that she for me might die?
My Mother!

Should I be doom'd, by heaven's decree,
To close those eyes that weep for me,
Then many a tear I'll shed for thee,
My Mother!

E. J.

THE YOUNG LADY'S CHOICE.

Give me the man that's learn'd without pretence,
Blest with good nature and good sense;
Whose generous, open, understanding heart,
Disdains to act a mean, dissembling part.
Who, once from virtue's path hath never stray'd,
Deceiv'd a fair one, nor a friend betray'd,
Where virtue reigns with an unbounded sway,
Then sense and reason prompts one to obey.
Such be the man with whom I spend my life,
Or never let me own the name of wife.

JUDAS ISCARIOT.

Some moderate divines make fine reflections on the modesty and charity of the apostles, who would not say that Judas Iscariot was damned, but that *he went to his place*, without daring to pass a judgment on his fate. There are others, however, who apprehend, that this expression denotes, that the traitor must have had a *particular place* of damnation, on account of the heinousness of his crime.—But if the

original shall be duly considered, it will appear, that the words do not respect *Judas*, but *Matthias*, and that they should, in this manner, be translated; *Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take possession of this ministry and apostleship* (from which Judas by transgression fell) *to go to his own place or office*. Each apostle having, as Norton Knatchbull hath justly observed, his particular jurisdiction or office.

Christian Mag.

MARRIED,

In Pawtucket, 14th inst. by Rev. Mr. Benedict, Mr. Henry Russell, to Miss Elizabeth C. Woodnurse, all of that place.

DIED,

In this town, on Monday evening last, Arnold Rhodes, infant son of Captain Ephraim Chace.

On Wednesday evening last, Sally Granger, infant daughter of Mr. Christopher C. Godfrey, aged 15 months.

On Thursday morning, Mrs. Rosalia Rawson, wife of Mr. Samuel Rawson, and daughter of Capt. James Gramont, in the 39th year of her age.—Funeral this afternoon, at 3 o'clock, from her late residence.

In Pawtucket, on Saturday last, Barney, infant son of Barney Merry, Esq. aged 8 months.

FOR SALE,

Two Wall Pews in the Universalist Chapel, Nos. 9 and 14, on the west side. For terms, apply at the Intelligence Office.

PROPOSALS

FOR PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION,
A COPIOUS DISSERTATION

ON THE

EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS,

In thirty Lectures, delivered, and delivering at the Universalist Chapel in Providence, R. I. In which every chapter and verse is considered and distinctly explained.

BY DAVID PICKERING.

These Lectures, with a table of contents, will contain about 500 pages, octavo, on fine white paper, with a new and elegant type.

The price to subscribers, handsomely bound and lettered, will be \$ 2,25, or \$ 2,00 in boards: Payable on delivery.

These proposals are issued in consequence of numerous requests for the publicity of the Lectures; and the work will be put to press as soon as 300 copies are subscribed for.

Any person, who shall obtain six subscribers, and become accountable for the payment of the same, shall receive a seventh gratis.

N. B.—Persons holding subscriptions are requested to return the same to B. CRANSTON, in Providence, R. I. by the 15th day of May next.

Just published, and for sale at this Office, and by S. W. Wheeler,

AN ADDRESS, delivered before Mount-Vernon Lodge, at their annual election, Feb. 22, 1825.—By DAVID PICKERING.

FANCY JOB PRINTING,

Neatly executed at this Office, at short notice, and on favourable terms.

All communications for the TELESCOPE must be addressed to the Editor, and *post paid*.